


KEVIN V. RYAN (CABN 118321)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

JOHN N. GLANG (GUAMBN 94012)
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408)-535-5084
Fax: (408)-535-5066



Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
PONG LIN LIU, et al,)
)
Defendants.)

No. CR 05-00723-JW

STIPULATION AND ORDER
RESCHEDULING STATUS HEARING
AND EXCLUDING TIME

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the undersigned that the status hearing in this case, currently scheduled for Monday, July 31, 2006 at 1:30 p.m. be vacated and rescheduled for Monday, October 2, 2006 at 1:30 p.m. The parties further stipulate that the court may exclude the period of time from July 31, 2006 through and including October 2, 2006 from the computation of the period of time within which the trial must commence for the reasons set forth in the proposed order below.

It is so stipulated.

Dated: _____

JOHN N. GLANG
Assistant U.S. Attorney

1 Dated: _____

KURT K. ROBINSON
Attorney for Pong Lin Liu

2 Dated: _____

CARLEEN R. ARLIDGE
Attorney for Derrick Vu

3 Dated: _____

SHAWN R. PARR
Attorney for Phuong Nguyen

4 Dated: _____

MATTHEW T. NEWMAN
Attorney for Bounxou Billamay

5 Dated: _____

VICKI H. YOUNG
Attorney for Chan Ho Mg Mg Liu

6 Dated: _____

MICHELLE D. SPENCER
Attorney for Man Ning Tao

7 Dated: _____

STEVEN F. GRUEL
Attorney for Man Nei Lui

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 **ORDER**


21 Based upon the stipulation of the parties, it is hereby ordered that the status hearing in this
22 case, previously scheduled for July 31, 2006 at 1:30 p.m., be vacated and rescheduled for
23 Monday, October 2, 2006 at 1:30 p.m.

24 Pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h), the court excludes the period of
25 time from July 31, 2006 through and including October 2, 2006 from the computation of the
26 period of time within which the trial must commence. The court FINDS that the ends of justice
27 served by the delay outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.
28 The court bases this finding on the need of some of the defense counsel in this case to continue to

1 review discovery provided by the government and determine whether any pretrial motions will be
2 made, the need of the parties to attempt to negotiate possible dispositions in this case, the
3 complexity of the case, and as time necessary for effective preparation, within the meaning of 18
4 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

5 It is so ordered:

6 Dated: 07/13/06
7


JAMES WARE
United States District Judge